

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:  
DAVID A. CASIMIR  
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP  
101 HOWARD STREET, SUITE 350  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

# PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>UM-09753</b>		Date of mailing (day/month/year) <b>30 AUG 2005</b>
<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below		
International application No. <b>PCT/US05/09378</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>22 March 2005 (22.03.2005)</b>	Priority date (day/month/year) <b>22 March 2004 (22.03.2004)</b>
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC <b>IPC(7): A61K 31/35, 31/12; C07C 49/23; C07D 311/04 and US Cl.: 514/456, 683; 568/329; 549/400, 401</b>		
Applicant <b>THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN</b>		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I      Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II      Priority
- ☐ Box No. III      Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV      Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V      Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability, citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI      Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII      Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII      Certain observations on the international application

## 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer <i>Valerie Bell-Harris</i> Amelia A. Owens Telephone No. 571-272-1600
--	---

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US05/09378

**Box No. I Basis of this opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐ a sequence listing

☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐ in written format

☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐ contained in international application as filed.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/US05/09378

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>2-5,8-25</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1,6,7</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>2-5,8-25</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1,6,7</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-25</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

**2. Citations and explanations:**

Claims 1,6,7 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Cain CA 62:36588 which teach species according to the invention as an antitumor agent. See RN 1251-81-6.

Claims 1,6,7 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Cain CA 58:59491 which teach species according to the invention as an antitumor agent. See RN 2965-44-8; 93657-66-0; 94866-99-6; 95626-03-2 to name a few.

Claims 2-5,8-25 meet under PCT Article 33 (2)-(3) because they are not included in the above objections as the specific limitations of the claims are not taught.

Claims 1-25 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.